THE Baptists Answer, TO Mr. OBED. WILLS, HIS APPEAL Against Mr. H. DANVERS.

(H. Knollys or)

LONDON, Printed for *Francis Smith*, at the *Elephant* and *Castle* in *Cornhill*, near the *Royal-Exchange*, 1675.

XUM

An *Advertiſment* from the Bookſeller.

THe *Impartial Reader deſiring Information into the Principle of Baptizing Believers, may be furniſh'd with the following Treatiſes, bound together, or ſeverally.*

A Treatiſe of Baptiſm; wherein that of Believers, and that of Infants is Examined by the Scriptures, with the Hiſtory of both out of Antiquity.

A Reply *to Mr.* Wills, *in Defence of the ſaid Treatiſe.*

A Second Reply *to Mr.* Baxter, *in Defence of the ſame.*

A Rejoynder *to Mr.* Wills *his* Vindiciæ; *with an Anſwer to his* Appeal; *all by Mr.* Henry Danvers.

A Treatiſe concerning the Covenant and Baptiſm; wherein is ſhewed, that Believers only are the Spiritual Seed of Abraham; *with a* Reply *to Mr.* Whiſtons Anſwer *to Mr.* Danvers, *by Mr.* Edward Hutchinſon: *With a* Letter [*of* Reproof] *to Mr.* Obed. Wills *by* T. B.

The Baptists Answer to Mr. Obed. Wills, *his* Appeal *against Mr.* H. Danvers.

SIR,

WE have seriously considered your *Appeal* against Mr. *Danvers*, and have also heard, and carefully weighed the *Defence* he makes thereto; and in order to give an Impartial *Judgment*, as you call us to, have desired some of our *Number* diligently to examine the *Authors* cited by you both; and though it appears to us, that Mr. *Danvers*, has earnestly endeavoured an *accomodation*, in a more pri-

vate and friendly manner, betwixt you and him, so to rectifie mistakes on any hand, which (had it been accepted of) might have saved this *trouble*; and that the Method you have used in this *Appeal* be unusual, and unlike the *Pattern* you seem to take; an *Appeal* in these Cases being then only *proper*, when the Party appealed against, appears to be so *contumacious*, and *stubborn*, as to *reject*, and stand out against just *conviction* and *admonition*; which we find not to be justly chargeable upon Mr. *Danvers*, and whether it be not rather your own oversight, we hope you will in time be sensible of; yet we say, we shall not insist upon that *Consideration*; and to give you, and the World that satisfaction *expected* from us, some

ſome of us whoſe names are ſubſcribed, have examined the Particulars you charge him with, and find ſome miſtakes and eſcapes on Mr. *Danvers* ſide, which he ingeniouſly acknowledges; and we hope may be to your full *ſatisfaon* as it cannot (in juſtice) but be to ours, ſince (as you ſeem to hint) *a publick owning, is what you expect.*

Some of the Particulars in your *Appeal*, we find to be ſo *trivial*, and *inſignificant*, that they deſerve not to be *mentioned*, and deem his Anſwers returned to them *reſpectively*, ſufficient to ſatisfie the Reader.

Others of your Charges he *traverſes*, and joyns iſſue with you at the *Bar* you have brought it to, and the moſt material of theſe we now remark to you; ſo that what

he *acknowledges*, and what's *inconſiderable*, and what's here further *examined*, comprehends your whole *Appeal*.

And we muſt obſerve to you, that you lie *obnoxious* to the Return you made to Mr. *Danvers*, when he charged you with leaving out part of the *Sentence* of *Nazianzen*, *viz. Si aliquid periculi immineat*, calling it, *p.* 7. of your *Vind. A frivolous Charge*; excuſing your ſelf after ſuch a manner as you will not be ſatisfied with from others; therefore if we ſay many of your Charges are *frivolous*, your Reaſon in your own behalf will *Juſtifie* us, you being Judge.

I. And therefore 1. we deſire you to conſider, whether the *ſtopping your Tranſlation out of* Calvin, *where you did*, p. 162. *Appeal*, be not

not unfair, and a misleading an *English* Reader.

II. You charge Coll' *Danvers Appeal*, *p.* 166. to adde the words, [*for it cannot be, that the Body should receive the Sacrament of Baptism till the Soul hath before received the truth of Faith*] and say they are not *Jeroms* Words, but of Mr. *Danvers* Adding: But upon Examination of that place [*Mat.* 28. *Tom.* 9. *Edit. Paris. An.* 1546.] we find them to be *Jeroms* Words Verbatim, as Mr. *Danvers* Cites them. And we observe in your *Quotation* of Mr. *Danvers*, in that place you *add*, [*Magd. Cent.* 4. *c.* 6. 418.] as if Mr. *Danvers* had particularly *Quoted the Magd.* there, which indeed he doth not; but only *Jerom* upon *Mathew*, which Double *Injury* we conceive

deſerves your Double *Conſideration*, in order to a Candid *acknowledgment*.

III. You charge him, *p.* 169. With abuſing *Calvin*, fathering *Eſtius's* Words upon him, though he hath owned it a miſtake in his *Reply*, But we obſerve alſo, That he Quotes *Eſtius Annot. Gen.* 17. 7. at the end, which you leave out, though you took all his words to that, and yet reprove him ſo often for the ſame, which ſeems neither *ingenious* nor *fair*.

IV. You charge him with abuſing Dr. *Hamond*, *p.* 107. in affirming, *That* βαπτισμος *ſignifies an Immerſion, or Waſhing the whole Body, anſwering the Hebrew* טבילה whereas you ſay the Dr. tells us, λουσις *ſignifies the waſhing the whole Body, and anſwers to* טבילה &c. We have *examined*

mined the Doctor's Book, Printed for *R. Royston*, *Anno* 1653 and find Mr. *Danvers* quoted his words truly, and the mistake to be yours, which we hope will convince you of the untrue and unjust reproach you subjoyn, *That he understands not English Authors*, &c.

V. You charge Mr. *Danvers* for affirming from *Walden*, That the *Wicklevians*, in agreement to the Doctrine of *Pelagius* and others, denyed Infant Baptism, he acknowledges it to be his mistake to alledge, That it was agreeable to *Pelagius* and others, (said to be for Infant Baptism) but if *Walden* be to be believed, it appears, That the *Wickliffists* judged Ecclesiastical Baptism unprofitable to little ones, in these words [*nostri* Wicliviste *Baptismum Ecclesiasticum*

cùm inutile judicant parvulis *contra omnes prædictos*] againſt all the aforeſaid, *viz. Pelagius*, *Vincentius Victor*, *and thoſe that Baptized Children, as born of Believing Parents.* And we muſt remark to you, that in your Quotation, *p.* 172. *Appeal*, you leave out [*parvulis*] the principal word there, and with what deſign or end we leave you to conſider.

VI. You charge him, *p.* 179, 180. for adding the Words [*it is our Will, That all that affirm, That Young Children receive Everlaſting Life, albeit they be not by the Sacrament of Grace or Baptiſm renewed*] to the *Milevitan Decree.* We have examined that 4*th. Tom. in Collect. Reg.* and find the *Canon* quoted by Mr. *Danvers* in *p.* 559. of it, taken out of a *very antient Copy*, immediately

ately following the Words you Cite, thus, *Item placuit, ut ſiquis dicit ideo dixiſſe dominum*; In domo patris mei manſiones multæ ſunt, *ut intelligatur, quia in regno Cœlorum erit aliquis medius, aut ullus alicubi locus, ubi beate vivant parvuli, qui ſine Baptiſmo ex hac vitâ migrarunt ſine quo in regno Cœlorum quod eſt vita æterna intrare non poſſunt, Anathema ſit, An. Chriſti* 424. Now for you to affirm, that the ſaid Clauſe was of Mr. *Danvers*'s own adding; whereas, as he ſays, *Here is an expreſs* Anathema *againſt thoſe that affirmed Children might be ſaved without Baptiſm, is* an Inſtance (to give the moſt favourable conjecture of it) that you have made but a lame ſearch: So that it is very juſt for us to acquit Mr. *Danvers* of this Charge. We preſume you know, that the *Magdeburgs*

burgs give an account when they ſpeak of that *Milevitan Synod*, of ſome that affirm'd Infants Salvation without Baptiſm, as by the Inſtances *Mr. Danvers* gives from them, undeniably appears; And in oppoſition to them was that *Anathema* enacted, and every Circumſtance concurs to evidence it as genuine as the other *Canons*: And therefore upon a review of the place we queſtion not but you will be ſatisfied here is no *forgery* or *prevarication* in *Mr. Danvers* in this Particular.

VII. Under the Head of his *fathering upon Authors that which they ſay not*, you charge him with abuſing *Baſil. Appeal p.* 181. in fathering thoſe Words upon him, [*muſt the faithful be ſealed with Baptiſm? Faith muſt precede, and go*

go before] whereas you say, *there is no such Speech in what the* Magd. *repeat of* Basil, contra Eunom. which we conceive to be a very weak ground for your Charge. For must it follow, that the Words are not *Basils*, because you find it not in the *Magdeburgs*? we have search'd *Basil*, and find his VVords to be *lib.* 3. *p.* 84. *contra Eunom.* to the sence he is Cited by Mr. *Danvers*, viz. πιστεῦσαι γὰρ δεῖ πρότερον εἶτα τῷ βαπτίσματι ἐπισφραγίζεσθαι, i. e. *It is necessary first to believe, and afterwards to be signed with Baptism.* So that this is also your own error and overfight.

VIII. You charge him with a notorious untruth, *p.* 185. for affirming from the *Magd. That* Gulielmus *added the* Virgin Mary *to the form of Baptism.* VVe have examined the *Magd. Cen.* 13. *p.* 419 *Cap* 4. *Edit.*

Edit. Basil Anno 1574. and find the words, *Male* Gulielmus *ad formam Baptismi addidit* Mariam *Baptizo te in nomine patris omnipotentis, & filii & spiritus sancti, & Beate Marie Virginis*, as Cited by *Mr. Danvers*; and therefore for you to affirm the contrary is a gross mistake.

And thus, Sir, we have given a true and impartial representation of the Particulars as we find them, being, as we conceive, the principal matters under our *Cognizance*, omitting the less material, & do recommend them to your *Christian consideration*, hoping that your serious review of them, will discover them to be your *errors*. And as *Mr. Danvers* has publickly owned what of mistake he is convinced of in his *Answer* to your *Appeal*: So it is justly *expected*, you will also, *according to your promise*

miſe in the Preface to your Appeal, do the ſame in theſe Particulars.

And ſince your Charges do not appear to be true to the ſatisfaction of all impartial perſons; but on the contrary great miſtakes on your ſide, you will not, we hope, *think it unjuſt if we acquit him, & reflect the blame of the Charge upon your ſelf, as you deſire, in caſe you be found in the error.*

The Particulars *Mr. Danvers* owns in his ſaid *Anſwer* to your *Appeal*, we bring not under our diſcuſſion or cenſure, concluding it to be enough that he acknowledges them.

And ſuch petty Charges as he *ſufficiently anſwers*, and are indeed of little weight, ſave to *inhaunce* the number of your Particulars, as alſo things controverted, and only *collateral* to the grand Propoſition in diſpute, (as are *thoſe things you call*

ſtrange

XUM

strange Doctrins, &c.) we think do not so properly offer themselves to our Considerations. And therefore we conclude we may be excused if we wave them.

And lastly, we propose, That if the Return we give to your *Appeal* should be deemed *insufficient* by you, or *short in* any thing, (which we are not conscious of) and that thereupon you take your self concerned to appear any further in *this Controversie*, you would be perswaded, that things may be transacted in an *amicable* and *friendly* way; which we hope may tend to our *mutual satisfaction* in the clearing up of Truth, and to Cherish that love, that all that fear the Lord should bear each other, though differing in some things, which is our very earnest desire; and to promote which, we shall endeavour to contribute the utmost we can.

London the 13*th*. of the 5*th*. Month 1675.

Hans. Knollys.
Will. Kyffen.
Dan. Dyke.
Jo. Gosnold.
Hen. Forty.
Tho. De Laune.

XUM